

1 MORRIS PETERSON
2 Steve Morris, No. 1543
3 Email: sm@morrislawgroup.com
4 Akke Levin, No. 9102
5 Email: al@morrislawgroup.com
6 Jean-Paul Hendricks, No. 10079
7 Email: jph@morrislawgroup.com
900 Bank of America Plaza
300 South Fourth Street
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
Telephone: (702) 474-9400
Facsimile: (702) 474-9422

8 WOOD, SMITH, HENNING & BERMAN LLP
9 Jason C. Gless, No. 8469
Email: jgless@wshblaw.com
10 7670 West Lake Mead Boulevard, Suite 250
Las Vegas, Nevada 89128
11 Telephone: (702) 222-0625
Facsimile: (702) 253-6225

12 Attorneys for Defendants

14 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
15 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

16 MARY ANN SUSSEX; MITCHELL PAE;) Case No. 2:08-cv-00773-RLH-PAL
17 MALCOLM NICHOLL and SANDY)
SCALISE; ERNESTO VALDEZ, SR. and)
18 ERNESTO VALDEZ, JR; JOHN)
HANSON and ELIZABETH HANSON,)

20 Plaintiffs,

) OPPOSITION TO MOTION TO
RELATE CASES AND TRANSFER
SECOND-FILED CASE TO FIRST-
FILED CASE

21 v.
22 TURNBERRY/MGM GRAND TOWERS,)
LLC, a Nevada LLC; MGM GRAND)
23 CONDOMINIUMS LLC, a Nevada LLC;)
THE SIGNATURE CONDOMINIUMS,)
LLC, a Nevada LLC; MGM MIRAGE, a)
24 Delaware Corporation; TURNBERRY/)
HARMON AVE., LLC, a Nevada LLC;)
25 and TURNBERRY WEST REALTY, INC.,)
a Nevada Corporation,)

27 Defendants.

1 Defendants Turnberry/MGM Grand Towers, LLC, MGM Grand
 2 Condominiums LLC, Inc., The Signature Condominiums, LLC, MGM Mirage,
 3 Turnberry/Harmon Ave., LLC, and Turnberry West Realty, Inc. (collectively
 4 "Defendants"), hereby oppose Plaintiffs' motion to relate cases and transfer the
 5 action entitled *George Abraham, et al v. Turnberry/MGM Grand, et al*, Case No:
 6 2:11-cv-01007-JCM-RJJ ("Abraham") to this Court.

7 **I. INTRODUCTION**

8 The Court should deny plaintiffs' motion to transfer to this Court the
 9 *Abraham* case filed earlier this year. There is no "related" case pending in this
 10 Court. The *Sussex* case, with which Abraham's lawyers wish to "consolidate" this
 11 case, is in arbitration, where the *Abraham* case belongs. An order "relating" these
 12 cases would accomplish the opposite of what LR 7-2.1 contemplates: Transfer
 13 would be a waste of time, the parties' money, and judicial resources. Defendants'
 14 motion to compel arbitration in *Abraham* is pending before Judge Mahan who is
 15 perfectly capable of taking judicial notice of this Court's June 16, 2009 order
 16 compelling the *Sussex* case to arbitration and ordering the *Abraham* plaintiffs to do
 17 likewise. The instant motion should be seen for what it is — a tactic by the
 18 *Abraham* plaintiffs' lawyers (who are the *Sussex* lawyers too) to further delay and
 19 avoid their clients' agreement to arbitrate their Signature claims. The motion
 20 should be denied.

21 **II. ARGUMENT**

22 There is no dispute between the parties that the *Sussex* action and the
 23 *Abraham* action involve the same defendants and similarly situated plaintiffs
 24 making the same or substantially similar claims regarding their purchases at the
 25 Signature at MGM Grand, a condominium-hotel project more than five years ago.
 26 That, however, is insufficient under Local Rule 7-2.1 to mandate finding these
 27 cases related and transferring them to this Court. Under LR 7-2.1, "[a]n action *may*
 28

1 be considered to be related to another action" (emphasis added) when it satisfies
 2 one or more of the criteria outlined in LR 7-2.1 a-d. Mot. at 2. Even if the Court
 3 finds that these actions are related, there is no language in the rule that compels
 4 relation and transfer of similar cases — the rule is discretionary. It is without
 5 question that the thrust of this rule is to, "effect a substantial savings of judicial
 6 effort," LR 7-2.1(c), to avoid the "substantial duplication of labor," *id.* 7-2.1(d) or to
 7 make a determination of the consolidation of the actions." *Id.*¹ None of these
 8 considerations are relevant to these cases because the parties in both *Sussex* and
 9 *Abraham* agreed to arbitrate their claims against Defendants.

10 In point of fact, the only consideration for the *Abraham* Court is to
 11 determine whether the *Abraham* plaintiffs entered into the same arbitration
 12 agreement as the one held valid and enforceable by the Nevada Supreme Court in
 13 the related *KJH & RDA Investor Group, LLC et al. v. Turnberry/MGM Grand Towers,*
 14 *LLC* ("KJH"). If they did, they must be sent to arbitration.² Defendants have
 15 already requested Judge Mahan take judicial notice of the KJH order and this
 16 Court's June 16, 2009, order compelling the *Sussex* plaintiffs to arbitrate. The most
 17 efficient means to this end is to deny the instant motion and allow Judge Mahan
 18 to consider the motion to compel arbitration that is pending before him in the
 19 *Abraham* action. There is simply no economy in transferring the case from one
 20 judge to another to decide this motion. The same work must be completed by
 21 either court.

22
 23 ¹ See also Fed. R. Civ. P. 42(a)(3), "If actions before the court involve a
 24 common question of law or fact, the court *may*: . . . (3) issue any other order to
 25 avoid cost or delay." (emphasis added). Again, consolidation of actions is
 26 discretionary to save the court's valuable resources. No such savings would
 27 result from a transfer of the *Abraham* action.

28 ² This Court's June 16, 2009, order compelling the *Sussex* plaintiffs to
 29 arbitration was based on the Nevada Supreme Court's decision in *KJH*. See Dkt.
 59.

1 There is no other benefit to relate the two actions and transfer the
2 *Abraham* action to this Court. *Sussex* is pending in arbitration before the American
3 Arbitration Association. This motion is nothing more than another of many
4 attempts by lawyers for the *Abraham* plaintiffs to buy more judicial time and
5 avoid their agreement to arbitrate claims related to the Signature project. The
6 motion should be denied.

7 | III. CONCLUSION

8 For the reasons stated above, the Court should not relate or transfer
9 the subject action to this court and the instant motion should be denied.

MORRIS PETERSON

By: Jean-Paul Hendricks
Steve Morris, No. 1543
Akke Levin, No. 9102
Jean-Paul Hendricks, No. 10079
900 Bank of America Plaza
300 South Fourth Street
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

WOOD, SMITH, HENNING & BERMAN LLP
Jason C. Gless, No. 8469
7670 West Lake Mead Blvd., Suite 250
Las Vegas, Nevada 89128

Attorneys for Defendants

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(b) and Section IV of District of Nevada
Electronic Filing Procedures, I certify that I am an employee of MORRIS
PETERSON, and that the following documents were served via electronic service:
**OPPOSITION TO MOTION TO RELATE CASES AND TRANSFER SECOND-
FILED CASE TO FIRST- FILED CASE**

TO:

8 Robert B. Gerard
9 Ricardo R. Ehmann
10 Gerard & Associates
11 2840 So. Jones Blvd. - Bldg. D, Suite 4
Las Vegas, Nevada 89146
rgerard@gerardlaw.com
rehmann@gerardlaw.com

13 Robert Fellmeth
University of San Diego Law School
5998 Alcala Park
14 San Diego, California 92110
15 cpil@sandiego.edu

16 Norman Blumenthal
Blumenthal & Nordrehaug
17 2255 Calle Clara
La Jolla, California 92037
18 norm@bamlawlj.com

19 Burton Wiand
Wiand Guerra King
20 3000 Bayport Drive - Suite 600
21 Tampa, Florida 33607
bwiand@wiandlaw.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff

DATED this 28^a day of November, 2011.

By: Arielle Galls